

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

Comparative Evaluation Descriptor Review
Working Group Meeting
Fourth Meeting

22 June 1983

Attending:

DDA Representative -
DDI " -
DDO " -
DDS&T " -
OP Representative -
and Review Coordinator



STAT

1. The members were reminded of our next two scheduled meetings set for 29 June and 13 July; each will be at 1 p.m. with room to be announced. The Agenda for this meeting had called for addressing the major question of the utility of the current system and perhaps reviewing the related issues of performance/potential balance, the desirability of precise/flexible wording and the appropriate number of categories. The major issue was, for the most part, settled through use of a pro and con format and a methodology for deciding the number of categories was determined.

2. The meeting began with the undersigned asking for a continuation of the discussion of the current system's assets and liabilities through use of a pro-con summary format. The major points expressed were:

Pro

- ° serves as a useful counseling mechanism
- ° assists in refining numerical rankings by putting them into perspective (e.g., an employee not ranked near the top can see prospect of continued advancement if placed in Category II)
- ° serves as a good device for deciding who gets or needs certain types of training
- ° helps focus on need for managerial action - either positive or remedial
- ° is a relatively simple system understandable to both management and the employee
- ° a good system which can be enhanced through use of narrative comments for each employee

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

Con

- Category III reidentified as the major problem because its narrative (and current application) allows the inclusion of too great a variety of employee - those with potential, those who probably do not have potential and the employee who would be better placed in Category IV
 - need for more positive wording in Category III (whether part of four or five-tier system).
3. During the discussion some important related points were made:
- any revised system should better define degrees of potential (e.g., Category III, in a five-tier system, should describe average potential)
 - part of problem with current system lies with Board/Panel members and management not properly exercising their responsibility. There are good and valid reasons to be placed in Categories III or IV but failure to make tough decisions often has employees placed one level higher than they should
 - the final report on this issue should contain a remark about the importance of management meeting its responsibilities and that the revised system will not work any better without same.
4. The representatives were asked to prepare by 13 July draft rewordings or revisions of the current system which may range from changes of words and sentences in the four-tier system to more significant revisions which could also involve change in the number of categories. This draft would then also serve as the representative's vote for the suggested number of categories which now appears to be split among a three, four or five-tier system; there is no current support for six (or more) categories.



STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY